

**REMARKS**

It is noted that Claims 1 to 6, and 9 to 25 have been indicated as being allowed. The allowance of these claims is acknowledged.

Reconsideration and allowance of the remaining claims, as amended, is respectfully requested in light of the comments presented hereinbelow.

**Amendment to the Disclosure**

Applicant respectfully requests that pages 3, 4, 5 and 12 of the disclosure be amended as set out hereinabove. It is contended that these amendments modify the format of the disclosure so as to provide a brief summary of the invention. In particular, the previous "summary" has been shortened, and an additional brief statement of the nature of the invention, has been added. No additional subject matter has been included as a result of this amendment. Thus, the "Summary of the Invention" is now in accordance with the guidelines set out by the Examiner.

**Amendment to the Claims**

Claims 7 and 26 to 39 currently stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner has identified various issues related to antecedence in Claims 7, 26 and 31. Accordingly, the Applicant has amended Claims 7, 26 and 31 in order to address the issues raised by the Examiner under 35 USC 112, and in particular, to provide proper antecedent for the phrases identified by the Examiner.

It is expected that the rejection of Claims 27 to 30 and 32 to 39 was as a result of being dependent on Claims 26 and 31 (identified hereinabove), and that these remaining claims are otherwise allowable in their present form.

It was also indicated in the Office Action Summary that Claim 8 has also been rejected. However, no specific issues were raised in the Action relating specifically with respect to Claim 8, which claim is dependent on allowed Claim 4. Applicant has, however, amended Claim 8 to clarify the scope of the claim, and to remove any doubt as to the antecedent for the phrase "data packet" by removing the word "contained". Applicant contends that Claim 8 is now allowable in its present format, particularly in light of the amendment made and described hereinabove.

A

Also, Applicant has voluntarily amended Claim 39 in order to replace the word "devices" with the non-plural term "device".

Prior Art

The Applicant has reviewed the prior art identified by the Examiner, but contends that the prior art devices do not provide the beneficial features of the present invention. In particular, Garney et al. (US 5890015) are concerned with facilitating the use of a wireless system in a USB application. Further, Ditzik (US 5983073) provides a notebook computer which can be used in a modular format, and can be equipped with a wireless communication system. Neither citation, however, provides a system for extending the range of a conventional USB based system as taught in the present invention.

Summary

In light of the amendments made and described hereinabove, the Applicant contends that all issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed and corrected, and that the present application is now in an allowable format. Further, the Applicant has reviewed the prior art cited by the Examiner, but contends that no amendment to the specification is required in light of the art cited.

Accordingly, favourable reconsideration and allowance of the present application is respectfully requested.

A return postcard is enclosed for stamping and return by the Patent Office.

Respectfully submitted,



Gerald A. Gowan  
627 Lyons Lane  
Suite 204  
Oakville, Ontario  
Canada L6J 5Z7

Gerald A. Gowan  
Regn. No. 37,041  
Agent for Applicant(s)  
Tel.: (905)-815-9267  
Fax.: (905)-815-9269

A